

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant responds herein to the Office Action dated May 20, 2003. A Petition for Extension of Time (three months) and the fee therefor are enclosed.

Claims 1-4 and 7-27 are being rejected as disclosed or easily conceivable from Sando, et al. (4,437,324), Kashiwaya, et al. (5,595,792), Edgerton (4,389,970) and Goffetre, et al. (5,196,100).

Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of claims 8 and 10. Similarly, claim 14 has been amended to include the limitations of claims 16 and 19, claim 21 has been amended to include the limitations of claims 20, 9 and 10, and claim 24 has been amended to include the limitations of claims 25 and 27. Reconsideration in view of the amendments to the claims is requested.

As amended, claims 1, 14, 21 and 24 include the chamber door and the chamber body, and the disposition of electrode in relation with the chamber body and the chamber door as characteristic features of the claimed invention.

Regarding the rejections under U.S.C. §102, it is respectfully submitted that none of the cited references by itself discloses a combination that includes a chamber door and a chamber body as claimed. Therefore, none of the cited references anticipates claim 1, claim 14, claim 21, or claim 24. Reconsideration is requested.

Regarding the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), it has been set forth that Goffetre, et al. teach the use of pivoting doors supporting electrodes parallel to the substance movement direction in a vertical deposition chamber for the purpose of providing operators with access to the electrodes when necessary.

However, the shape of the electrode and the disposition of the electrode in relation with the chamber body and the chamber door according to the present invention are different from those shown by Goffetre, et al. That is, according to the present invention an electrode with a shape of a plate is attached in the chamber body or at the chamber door so that only one face thereof (the opposite face of the substrate) participates in plasma discharging, thus preventing the generation of carbide on the other face due to the polymerization material.

Accordingly, it is clear that the apparatus according to the present invention can effectively reduce the amount of carbide released from the electrode which can fall and damage the surface of a substance. This result cannot be accomplished by Goffetre, et al.

In conclusion, the present invention as a whole is clearly distinguished from Sando, et al. (4,437,324), Kashiwaya, et al. (5,595,792), Edgerton (4,389,970) and Goffetre, et al., and cannot be foreseen in view of the cited references. Reconsideration is, therefore, requested.

Each of the remaining claims depends from one of claims 1, 14 and 21, and, therefore, includes at least the limitations of its base claim. Each of these claims includes other limitations, which in combination with those of its base claims are not shown or suggested by the art of record. Reconsideration is requested.

The application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Such action is earnestly solicited.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on November 20, 2003

Kourosh Salehi

Name of applicant, assignee or
Registered Representative

Signature

November 20, 2003

Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,

**FILE
COPY**

Kourosh Salehi

Registration No.: 43,898

OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP

1180 Avenue of the Americas

New York, New York 10036-8403

Telephone: (212) 382-0700

BEST AVAILABLE COPY